

Pat Simon/DC/USEPA/US  
05/03/2007 11:10 AM

To Phillip Schindel/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
cc Gary Carrozza/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Jeff  
Meetre/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
bcc  
Subject Re: Fw: more EJ notes

Thanks Phil,  
I see you did have it attached to the FR. Great.

Patricia Simon  
Associate Award Official  
Phone: (202) 564-5363  
Fax: (202) 565-2470  
Phillip Schindel/DC/USEPA/US

Phillip  
Schindel/DC/USEPA/US  
05/03/2007 10:34 AM

To Jeff Meetre/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Pat  
Simon/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary  
Carrozza/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
cc  
Subject Fw: more EJ notes

Jeff, Pat, Gary,

I'll be distributing OEJ's Regional competition summaries to the GS's individually. They cover the rest of what we were looking for in the competition section. Based on the GCA webpage 'selection documentation guidance,' here's what we were looking for [and what Ayako provided]:  
general description of the type of projects to be funded  
how many applicants  
how many eligible  
brief discussion of the evaluation criteria  
range of score info

So to keep everything straight, here is where our competition documentation will be found:  
FR attachment w/ brief Rationale.doc  
email 4/30/07 from Ayako to each GS w/ a table "Summary of Strengths & Weaknesses" specific to each grant  
email 5/3/07 from ME to each GS with a Summary R#.doc

re: Statutory Authority, as noted below Ayako is working on those for each grant, too

Phil Schindel  
US EPA Grants & Interagency Agreement Management Division  
202-564-5293  
fax 202-565-2470  
schindel.phillip@epa.gov

.....  
Please tell us whether we're doing our job to your satisfaction by completing the OARM Customer Satisfaction

Survey:

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=727791978418>

Thank you for helping us improve our service to you!

----- Forwarded by Phillip Schindel/DC/USEPA/US on 05/03/2007 09:33 AM -----



Ayako Sato/DC/USEPA/US

05/03/2007 09:12 AM

To: Phillip Schindel/DC/USEPA/US@EPA











cc

Subject: Re: more EJ notes

Hello Phil -

I spoke to my supervisor and she is really concerned with pushing the date back since the AA of OECA is planning to make a press release on or as close to May 15th. We'll have to inform him that we cannot make the announcement because the packages have not been processed. I have really been working hard to get the things you need and have tried to get loose items to you no later than a day turn around time for any requests. I hope this is not the reason for the award date change.

In the meantime here is the Competition summaries for each region. You should get a statutory authority write-up by the end of the day.

        
Summary R1.doc Summary R2.doc Summary R3.doc Summary R4.doc Summary R5.doc Summary R6.doc Summary R7.doc  
    
Summary R8.doc Summary R9.doc Summary R10.doc

Ayako Sato  
OECA/Office of Environmental Justice  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW (2201A)  
Washington, DC 20460  
P (202) 564-5396  
F (202) 501-0740  
Phillip.Schindel@DC/USEPA/US

Phillip  
Schindel/DC/USEPA/US  
05/02/2007 04:13 PM

To: Ayako Sato/DC/USEPA/US@EPA

cc

Subject: more EJ notes

Ayako,

As I said, I'm not sure if all this will come across clearly in an email, but here's my best shot. After we talked (Jeff, Pat, LaShaun for Gary, and I) yesterday we came to the conclusion that we would have a much better idea of where we are in signing them next Monday. You'll probably agree that is way too close to the 15th to risk a lot of uncertainty, so I'm afraid we need to push the date back. I haven't



proposed this to anyone yet, but I would think that we're looking at 2 more weeks because if we don't have them signed by the 15th, Pat is likely to be out the rest of that week, and we would really be talking about her looking at anything left to sign during the week of the 21st. I also talked to Barbara, who is swamped, and she said she hadn't started on either hors or NY SWAN. Nancy Kok took NY SWAN to review, but I haven't found a happy-home for Barbara's [yet].

Other things that came out of the conversation:

Jeff tells me that he got a better Statutory Authority justification from you than what was initially in the FR. Pat and Cary will want to see the same things for the other projects, too. Basically what he described was that we want to see something in the format:

"This project relates to statutes xyz which authorize EPA to \_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_. This project supports those statutes by \_\_\_\_\_. " Looking back at my project for ARCHS, I would translate that to mean that Pat will ask for a re-wording of what you already have to include the authorizing language.

It seems like the deeper we look into any issue, the more things there are to find. We went over the "Selection Documentation Guidance" from the GCA website (and then I went over it again separately with Lenee to be sure), and I pulled out the items in red as being things that you surely have in your files but that GCA guidance tells us we need to have in the Grants files, too.

a. summary of the competition (include: the date the announcement was issued, a general description of the type of projects solicited under the competition, how many applicants applied, how many were deemed eligible, how the evaluation and ranking was conducted by the review panel, a brief discussion of the criteria proposals were evaluated against, and anything else that may be pertinent to this competition)

\*\*\*\*\*

In the next section what we're kind of looking for is a clarification that each grant selected for funding was the top proposal within its Region. We figured that out, but there's nothing saying that anywhere. Within each Regional group we should get an idea of the range of scores and what set the top proposal apart from the rest.

b. discussion of how the applicant scored/ranked in comparison to other applicants based on the criteria in the announcement (describe: the ranking scores, the range of ranking scores from highest to lowest, how many proposals/applications were selected for funding, how this applicant scored/ranked in comparison to other applicants selected for funding (if more than one) and with respect to all applicants (e.g., the applicant, who received 90/100 possible points, was the highest ranked applicant of the 25 applicants who submitted proposals and were evaluated, and the highest ranked applicant recommended for funding; e.g., the applicant, who received 80/100 possible points, was the third ranked applicant of the 25 applicants who submitted proposals and were evaluated. Of the 4 proposals recommended for funding, the applicant was the third highest scored applicant),

Phil Schindel  
US EPA Grants & Interagency Agreement Management Division  
202-564-5293  
fax 202-565-2470  
schindel.philip@epa.gov

.....  
Please tell us whether we're doing our job to your satisfaction by completing the OARM Customer Satisfaction  
Survey:  
<http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=727791978418>  
Thank you for helping us improve our service to you!  
.....